Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MICHAEL S. REGAN,

Defendant.

Case No. <u>22-cv-</u>03309-RS

ORDER SCHEDULING BRIEFING

Plaintiffs are non-profit environmental advocacy groups who originally filed this action as a citizen's suit under the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401–7671q, seeking to compel the Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") to carry out allegedly outstanding legal obligations to promulgate Federal Implementation Plans ("FIP") pertaining to nonattainment areas in California and New Hampshire. Complaint, Para. 1, Dkt. No. 1. Plaintiffs subsequently filed an amended complaint adding a claim (among others) to compel the EPA to "take final action on State Implementation Plans ("SIP") for the 2008 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards ("NAAQS")" in several specified nonattainment areas, including Colorado. Amended Complaint, Para. 1, Dkt. No. 23.

Prior to any court adjudication on the merits, the parties submitted a joint motion to enter a consent decree. Dkt. No. 35. Pursuant to that joint motion, judgment was entered in the form proposed by the parties. Dkt. No. 37.

Plaintiffs then filed a motion to "enforce" the consent decree. The day opposition to that

Case 3:22-cv-03309-RS Document 56 Filed 01/04/24 Page 2 of 2

	2
Northern District of California	3
	3
	5
	6
	5 6 7 8
	8
	Q
	10
	11
	12
	13
	13 14
	15 16
	17
	18
	18 19
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26

United States District Court

1

27

28

motion was due, the State of Colorado sought leave to intervene in the action and to extend the date for opposition. An order issued that same day suspending briefing on plaintiffs' motion. Defendant, however, proceeded to file opposition as originally scheduled.

At this juncture, Colorado's request to intervene and to file separate opposition to plaintiffs' motion will continue to be held in abeyance. Plaintiffs may file any reply brief in support of their motion within one week of the date of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 4, 2024

Chief United States District Judge